

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/625,796   | 07/23/2003      | Tadashi Inoue        | · 01206CD/HG            | 9019             |
| 1933   | 7590 11/07/2005 |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |
| FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC<br>220 5TH AVE FL 16<br>NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708 |                 |                      | YEE, DEBORAH            |                  |
|  |                 |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
| ,  |                 |                      | 1742                    |                  |
|  |                 |                      | DATE MAILED: 11/07/2005 | 5                |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) |  |
|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 10/625,796      | INOUE ET AL. |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit     |  |
| Deborah Yee     | 1742         |  |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -EPLY FILED 19 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonm

| THE REPLY FILED 19 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICA  | ATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.  |
|--|--|
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the sar<br>this application, applicant must timely file one of the following rep<br>places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of A<br>a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 3<br>time periods:  | lies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which<br>appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3)                            |
| <ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the fire</li> </ul>   | aal rejection  |
|  | Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. If SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.                  |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).   | OHEOR BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REFER WAS TIED WITHIN   |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than thromay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee<br>I statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL   |  |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance we filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension the a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>  | ereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since   |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior  | to the date of filing a brief will not be entered because  |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further considerat  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  |  |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form appeal; and/or   | for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for  |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a correspondent NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  | onding number of finally rejected claims.  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See   | attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).   |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  |  |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable non-allowable claim(s).   |  |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will in how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided be The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>17-24</u> .  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>  | or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered ent reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and                    |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice<br>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcom-<br>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was   | e all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a  |
| IO. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  |  |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but does N<br/>See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>   | NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  |
| 2. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SE  | 3/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).   |
| 13. ☐ Other:   | , <u> </u>   |

Deborah Tee Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1742 Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: it was submitted that Ushioda does not teach a galvanized steel having a tensile strength of 440MPA or a microstructure comprising ferrite together with martensite, bainite or pearlite. It is the examiner's posiiton that these limitations are not recited by the claims and would not be a patentable consideration..